<u>REMARKS</u>

Claims 1, 2, 8, 10, and 30-45 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 1, 8 and 34 have been amended as shown on pp. 2-7 of the Reply. Entry of these amendments is respectfully requested. It is submitted that the amendments to claims 1, 8 and 34 do not introduce new matter or limitations that require additional consideration. The amendments place the application in better condition for appeal or allowance as independent claims 1, 8 and 34 have been amended to correlate to independent claims 35 and 36 that are rejected on the same grounds. Applicants' representative thanks Examiner Chen for the courtesies extended during the telephone interview conducted on September 4, 2008. Distinctions between the cited reference and the claims were discussed; however, no agreements were reached.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I.   <u>Rejection of Claims 1-2, 8, 10, and 30-45 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)</u>

Claims 1-2, 8, 10, and 30-45 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Holder et al. (US 2002/0019824). It is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Holder et al. does not disclose each and every limitation of the subject claims.

> A single prior art reference anticipates a patent claim only if it
> ***expressly or inherently describes each and every limitation set
> forth in the patent claim***. *Trintec Industries, Inc. v. Top-U.S.A.
> Corp.,* 295 F.3d 1292, 63 USPQ2d 1597 (Fed. Cir. 2002); *See
> Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California,* 814 F.2d 628, 631,
> 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). The ***identical invention
> must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the …
> claim***. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.,* 868 F.2d 1226, 9 USPQ2d
> 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989) (emphasis added).

The claimed subject matter relates to accessing data in a data source *via* a hierarchical representation or a relational representation of the data regardless of the structure of the data source (*See* Summary). In particular, claim 1 recites *a computer-implemented system for accessing data, comprising a parser that receives and parses information associated with a data*

source, a data document component that receives at least a portion of the parsed information, the data document component stores a hierarchical model representation of the portion of the parsed information associated with the data source and **a data set component that receives the portion of the parsed information, the data set component stores a relational model representation of the portion of the parsed information associated with the data source**. Claim 1 further recites that *the data set component and the data document component coordinate to enable changes made to the portion of the parsed information stored in the hierarchical model representation to be synchronized to corresponding data stored in the relational model representation and changes made to the portion of the parsed information stored in the relational model representation to be synchronized to corresponding data stored in the hierarchical model*. Holder et al. does not disclose **each and every** limitation of claim 1.

Holder et al. relates to generically describing and manipulating arbitrary data structures. (*See* Abstract). Data available in different kinds of repositories can be modeled in a uniform way to enable access to the data in a generic way. (*See* paragraph 12). For instance, a resource can be located, an XML file describing the structure of the resource can be read, hierarchical control information can be generated and access can be enabled. (*See* paragraph 15). Multiple resources can be expressed in a single schema and duplicate data can be updated across all resources. (*See* paragraph 22). For instance, interfaces can be established for each resource within the schema such that actual access to the resource is conducted by the interfaces while a generic schema is presented to users. (*See* paragraph 20). A resource includes a schema and a tree-structure is constructed in accordance with the schema. Additional resources can be joined (e.g., added) to the tree-structure. When changes to the tree-structure occur, the underlying interfaces associated with individual resources are invoked to update the original resources. (*See* paragraphs 24-26). When accessing one or more resources, the cited reference discloses an engine that constructs a tree structure according to the schemas of the resources. (*See* paragraph 62). The tree-structure is populated with actual contents of the resources. (*See* paragraph 66).

Accordingly, the cited reference discloses constructing a *single* tree-structure (e.g., hierarchical data structure) based upon schemas of one or more underlying heterogeneous resources. Nowhere does Holder et al. disclose a data document component that stores a hierarchical representation of data from a data source **and** a data set component that stores a relational representation of data from a data source. Rather, the cited reference describes

combing a plurality of resources into a single tree representation. Holder et al. relates to providing a generic, uniform interface to one or more heterogeneous resource. In the claimed subject matter, a data source is parsed to generate **both** a hierarchical representation and a relational representation of the data. Thus, the cited reference relates to combining multiple resources into a single representation whereas the claims recite providing multiple representations of a single data source.

Moreover, as Holder et al. fails to disclose a data set component that stores a relational representation of data from a data source and a data document component that stores a hierarchical representation, the cited reference likewise fails to disclose coordination between the two components. As recited in the claim, changes made to data parsed from the data source, in either the relational representation or the hierarchical representation are synchronized to the other representation. For instance, changes made via the hierarchical representation are synchronized to the relational representation and vice versa.

Further yet still, it is stated in the subject Final Object Action that Holder et al. discloses a data set component at paragraphs 5. However, the cited portion defines a resource as a data item, a data set, and/or structural elements. Claim 1 recites a data set *component* that stores a relational representation of a portion of data parsed from a data source. The cited portion does not disclose receiving a portion of parsed data from a data source and storing a relational representation. Rather, the cited portion discloses a resource can be a data set. A data set (e.g., data) is not a component that receives and stores a relational representation of data from a data source.

Dependent claim 30 recites a structural inference component that infers a relational model structure of the data source. Holder et al. requires, as a pre-requisite, a schema of a resource to be provided in an associated XML file. Thus, schemas are already provided. Holder et al. does not disclose inferring a relational model structure of a data source as the systems disclosed in Holder et al. are provided, as a pre-requisite, with an XML file that describes the schema of a resource.

Independent claim 8 recites a data set component that stores a relational model representation of a portion of the data in the XML source document. As discussed *supra*, Holder et al. does not disclose a relational model representation of data stored in an XML source document. Rather, the cited reference relates to constructing a tree-structure (e.g., a non-

relational representation) from one or more resources. In addition, Holder et al. does not disclose propagating changes between a relational representation and a hierarchical representation of data in the XML source document. Similarly independent claims 34-36 respectively recite *generating a hierarchical model representation of at least a first portion of the parsed data and a relational model representation of at least a second portion of the parsed data, means for constructing a relational model representation of at least a second portion of the parsed information* and *a data set component that retains at least a portion of the extracted data from the data source as a relational representation, the data set component enables access to the portion in a relational manner*. For at least the reasons described above, the cited reference, Holder et al., does not disclose such aspects.

It is evident from the above discussion that Holder et al. discloses merging structures of one or more resources into a *single* tree structure. Holder et al. is silent regarding storing *both* a hierarchical model representation and a relational model representation of information in a data source and further coordinating the two representations such that changes made to one representation are reflected in the other representation as recited by the subject claims. The cited reference provides a single hierarchical representation of one or more resources while the claimed subject matter enables access to a data source *via* a hierarchical model representation and/or a relational model representation.

In view of at least the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that Holder et al. does not disclose, teach or suggest each and every limitation recited by claims 1, 2, 8, 10 and 30-45. Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP250US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP

  /Evan T. Perry/
Evan T. Perry
Reg. No. 62,190

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP
24TH Floor, National City Center
1900 E. 9TH Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731